



H.C.P.(MD)No.1096 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 12.11.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1096 of 2025

S.Vinotha

... Petitioner/Mother of the Detenu

-VS-

1.State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. by The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (xiv) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2. The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Thanjavur, Thanjavur District.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichirappalli

4.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Pattukkottai,
Thanjavur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in P.D.No.61/2024 dated 21.11.2024 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue or body of the detenue namely, the petitioner's son Krishnan @ Muthupandiyan, son of



H.C.P.(MD)No.1096 of 2025

Selvaraj now detained at the Central Prison, Trichirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.D.Johnson
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **C.V.Karthikeyan, J.**)

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, by name T Krishnan @ Muthupandiyan, son of Selvaraj , aged about 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.61/2024 dated 21.11.2024 holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that at page Nos.72 and 74, the documents are not legible and it is totally indecipherable. Additionally, at page No.



46, the remand order is written in freehand and it is also not decipherable. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation. These defects in the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

4. In this context, it is useful to refer to the Judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of *Powanammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, reported in (1999) 2 SCC 413, wherein the Apex Court, after discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, observed that the detenu should be afforded an opportunity of making a representation effectively against the detention order and that, the failure to supply every material in the language which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative. The relevant portion of the said decision is extracted hereunder:

"9. However, this Court has maintained a distinction between a document which has been relied upon by the detaining authority in the grounds of detention and a document which finds a mere reference in the grounds of detention. Whereas the non-supply of a copy of the document relied upon in the grounds of



detention has been held to be fatal to continued detention, the detenu need not show that any prejudice is caused to him. This is because the non-supply of such a document would amount to denial of the right of being communicated the grounds and of being afforded the opportunity of making an effective representation against the order. But it would not be so where the document merely finds a reference in the order of detention or among the grounds thereof. In such a case, the detenu's complaint of non-supply of document has to be supported by prejudice caused to him in making an effective representation. What applies to a document would equally apply to furnishing a translated copy of the document in the language known to and understood by the detenu, should the document be in a different language.

...

...

16. For the above reasons, in our view, the nonsupply of the Tamil version of the English document, on the facts and in the circumstances, renders her continued detention illegal. We, therefore, direct that the detenue be set free forthwith unless she is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed."



H.C.P.(MD)No.1096 of 2025

5. We find that the above cited **Powanammal's** case applies in all force to the case on hand as we find non-furnishing of legible copy of the documents relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page No.72,74 and 46 of the first Booklet. This illegible copy of remand order to the detenu, has impaired his constitutional right to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order. To be noted, this constitutional right is ingrained in the form of a safeguard in Clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India. We, therefore, have no hesitation in quashing the impugned detention order.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.61/2024 dated 21.11.2024 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Krishnan @ Muthupandiyan, son of Selvaraj, aged about 27 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[C.V.K., J.] [R.V., J.]
12.11.2025

CM



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1096 of 2025

To

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (xiv) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Thanjavur, Thanjavur District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichirappalli
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Pattukkottai,
Thanjavur District.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1096 of 2025

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
and
R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

CM

H.C.P.(MD)No.1096 of 2025

12.11.2025